P. 7 105-93

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1891-92

192 .

(R. R.)

File No 142-91

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later references.

R 373-02

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

M ~~Part~~ B for March 1894.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Lakkonidevamma, widow of Kenchappa, Nakkalu Shanbhoge of Naddavadi praying ~~that the Duty for Grade~~ for the Registership of the Shanbhogue of the said Village

1

14

M 696 of 1893-94

Appl
Lakshmudevamma
of Vaddarhalli
Sira Taluq
Tumkur Dt

Resd
1 Ramanna
2 ~~Puttanna~~ Shamanna
Cousin of No 1

In 1878 Appt's ~~Petitioner~~ late husband who was Shanbhog of Vaddarhalli Firka was sentenced to imprisonment for receiving gratification from poor people relief under which was granted. He applied for the 1st Resd to be appointed in his place but he was ~~eventually~~ not formally authorized to the office. In 1887, the 1st & 2d Respts who were each supporting one Firka quarrelled amongst themselves & entered into an amicable settlement by which the Firka of Vaddarhalli came to the share of the 2d Respt, & the other two Firkas to the share of

1 a distant Kinsman

The 1st Respt & the
amicable arrangt was
confirmed by the Dy
Comr in June 1887.
So, the Appts late
husband's Jotka was not
held by the 2d Respt ~~Smith~~ through
~~Appt~~ in effect, both the
1st & 2d Respts may be
said to be in possession of the same
~~of Pattanhalli~~.

~~Smith~~ 6) There is no
reason whatever for
disturbing the existing
arrangement, ~~but~~ Govt
consider that Appt is
entitled to some consideration
The Potagi of Pattanhalli =
Jotka is No ~~47~~ 59 & that
of the other 2 Jotkas
engaged by the 1st Respt
is ~~No 84~~ No 72 & Govt have
decreed that 20 No out
of the Potagi of the 1st Respt

& 10 Rs out of the Pstge
A/c deposit be paid
to the applt for her
maintenance. The
Dy Const will arrange
accordingly.

26/2/94

Send C
Applt is referred to the
Dy Const to whom
orders have been
issued.

SR 142-91-1

(1) Petition duly stamped

(2) Copy of Dy Comrs last order forwarded

(3) Appeal in time from date of Dy Comrs last order

(4) Rule I cl (1) of the Hoc Rules

Call for Reps
B.O.
4/5/92

I now see their Memo of appeal to late by nearly 9 months. The appeal cannot be admitted for hearing unless the delay is explained

4

(General Serial No. 32.)

W 139.

No. 1653

Name of Petitioner. Sankaranarayana Kanchappa Shanbhag

Village. Vadiyanahalli

Taluk. Tumkur

District. Do

Date of Arzi. 25/8/91

Date of Receipt. 29.10.91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Six.

ABSTRACT.

Prays that Shamanna & Lakshmana who deceitfully got the Shanbogaship of Vadiyanahalli Taluk, Tumkur removed from office, that the petitioner the wife of the deceased Sankaranarayana Kanchappa Shanbhag be made the Shanbogue thereof, and that such be taken from a family to be nominated by her.

Endorsement:—

This case referred to

have been already disposed of. You may take copy of order and then prefer your complaint.

C/ P.N. Krishnamurti
By: Comm.

Endorsement No 553 of 31.7.84:—

You have been informed by Endorsement 3/5/84. No 19, that the previous Dy: Co's order could not be interfered with. No action will be taken of frequent petitions on the same subject.

C/ S. C. Reddy
Dy: Comm.

Endorsement No 844 of 20.8.84:—

As the case has been disposed of by Dy: Comm. Mr. Krishnamurti, Esq, it cannot be re-opened.

C/ T.V. Venkataramaiya
Dy: Comm.

.6

LR 142-91-2

R.

Endl issued

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE, 11-5

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. (9)

1653, 4224, 3862 and

The accompanying Petition No. 201

dated 25/3, 2/12/91, 14/12/91 received at the 18/4/92

Dewan's Office from Lakshmidevamma widow of Kenchappa, Huckdar Shanbogue of Vo. Hanchalli Devi Taluk, praying that the name be made registered Shanbogue of Vo. Hanchalli

are

is forwarded, together with its ~~its~~ enclosures, to the Deputy Commr Tumkur Dist for submission of Proceedings

From the Dewan, No. 142, 11/4/92

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
11-May 1892

Petition
Order 11th
Lr 14-2-3

Received
Noted
Entered
Copied
Indexed
Despatched
Appealed
Printed
Rep Rd
Returned
RO

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE
22 JUN 92
P. 38
MYSORE

1891. 357

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore

Dated Tumkur 17th June 1892
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. Records and petitions as the case

General No.
No 61

Sir

I have the honor to submit herewith the Proceedings connected with the petition of Lukshmi devamma widow of Kenchappa, Huk-dar Shanbogue of Vaddam-halli in the Sira Taluk called for in your official memo No. 55 of the 11th May 1892.

2. The petition received with your memo under reply is herewith returned with its enclosures.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servt

Deputy Commissioner

Ag
27-6-92


MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 16537
DATE 29-10-91

LR 142-91-4 12

16-9-92

No. 1663-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
16 Sept 1892

(11)

Endorsement granted to Lakshmidevamma, widow of Ranchappa, Amildar, Shanbogue of Hattimahalli, Sira Tk, Tumkur Distt,
in reply to her Petition Registered No. 553 dated 25 Aug 92.

Petitioner is informed that her appeal is rejected as it was preferred beyond the time prescribed by law.

2. The encls are returned.

"By Order,"

Draft.

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.

LR 142-91-5

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 696

Name of Petitioner. Lakshmidevamma

Residence & Caste Nanchilpet, Shanbhog

Village. Vaddamanalu Agrahara

Taluk. Sira Taluk

District. 53

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt. 6-9-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Eight.

ABSTRACT.

Petition for Review of Application

Prays that the order, rejecting her appeal on the ground of its being barred by limitation, contained in this office endorsement no: 1453, dated 16th Sept: 1892, may be reviewed on the ground that she (her Appeal) is not barred by limitation as she is now only a year old & so, she was a minor all the time.

Granted

16/9/93

13

X 36 of 1878

Sira Taluq Shanbhogs Agrahara

Vaddamanalu

15-9-93

Petitioner prays that her appeal to the Shanbhogi of Vaddamanalu rejected by the Revenue Authority may be reopened and she permitted to represent her own grievance, or that the present holder of the office may be ordered to plead in maintenance.

In the year 1878 the deceased was tortured to imprisonment for [illegible] receiving propitiation from two people whom the Sirsta relief money was granted by the Sirsta was for done them without a Shanbhog. The Circular then sent for a person who was Shanbhog of a different Sirsta, Ramanna X Vaddamanalu Sirsta & appointed a year. He in-quired that parties should be produced at the Vaddamanalu time, but the proceedings were then not finally taken place.

In 1887 Lakshmamma who had two sons possession of Vaddamanalu Sirsta, and Shamanna another cousin, offered an amicable arrangement with expense & distance between them regarding the Sirsta and in consequence of it Shamanna possession Vaddamanalu Sirsta & Shamanna. He then represented that the Sirsta came & them by the death of Venkatappa (Lakshmamma) without issue, & the arrangement was approved by the Asst Com: (Mr Krishna Murthi) on 16 Nov: 1887.

Lakshmamma died in January 1889 appearing that she had been a minor. The Asst Com: (Mr Krishna Murthi) said that the matter upon which Lakshmamma had been ignored and then ruled the case of [illegible] the then ruled a petition on 16 June 1890 against on 29th December Sept: 1890, but the Sirsta Com: has since Lakshmamma's decision before in a matter decided by their predecessor.

The appeal to the Asst Com: on 23 Sept: 1891 but on 2nd was out of time it was rejected on 16 Sept: 1892. This appeal is filed nearly a year after it was rejected.

Petitioner says she has paid fee in the first case and is too poor to pay it over again.

The question for consideration is whether under

14

[illegible] circumstances of the case the Petition may be admitted
Submitted to the Counsel

~~Notice to be of admitting the Petition~~

As Petitioner was a Minor, & she is now only 20 years old, her Petition may be admitted —

Fix a date for hearing & give notice to parties.

20/12/93

[illegible]

Posted to 22nd February 1894.

& the land under cultivation, rate of rent &c

3rd year, 1888-89 to 1890-91.

	nd under cultivation of Rampur district		
	1890-91.		Remarks
	Area	Revenue	
	k-k-0	a-a-0	
	14-18-5¼	180-2-1	
4	34-8-15¾	41-5-4-4	
6	10-11-6¾	1-5-8-1	
4	13-13-8	1-5-8-4	
9	5-3-17¼	650-12-2	
6	130-16-2	16-2-2-a	
-a	37-14-2½	5-3-3-a	
11	92-10-13¾	955-5-3	
5	80-12-2½	10 20-1-4	
6	a-10-10	9-4-5	
4	46-1-2	536-10-10	
11	104-8-6¾	346-9-10	
6	148-10-1½	1-1-2-5-5	
3	73-15-15¾	884-1-4	
-a	581-9-4¾	1-0-8-3-8	
	63-5-5½	811-5-11	
	16-1-1	15-2-12-9	
	7-14-4¼	8-2-9-a	
	27-13-3½	31-2-8-2	
	65-18-2	1045-1-7	
	32-1-11¼	3-5-9-2	
	a	313-10-a	
	a	222-5-6	
	a	a	
	448-11-11½	5548-14-10	
-6	1160-17-2¼	14236-4-6	

Asst Commissioner

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Petn. ~~Appeal~~ No. 696 of 1893-94.

Appellant. Vs. Respondents

1 Lakshmidevamma of Vadasandhe, Sira Taluk Tumkur District

1 Ramanna
2 Thimmanna Boya } No. 1 represented by M. A. Narasimha Iyengar

Decision 26th February 1894

In about 1873, Appellant's late husband who was Shanbhog of Vadasandhe Devika was sentenced to imprisonment for receiving gratification from persons to whom relief moneys were granted. The Amildar put in 1st Respondent a distant kinsman in charge of the office but he was not formally appointed to the office till 1881, the 1st and 2nd Respondents who were each supposed one sixth guaranteed among themselves and entered into an amicable ~~agreement~~ arrangement by which the Devika of Vadasandhe came to the share of the 2nd Respondent and the other five Devikas to the share of

of the 2nd Respondent, and this favourable arrangement was confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner in November 1894. So, the Appellant's late husband's duties to our heirs by the 2nd Respondent, ~~and~~ the Khoshchi officer, both the 1st and 2nd Respondents may be said to be in possession of the same ~~Khoshchi~~.

2. ~~Though~~ There is no necessary balance for continuing the existing arrangement, the Government considers that Appellant is entitled to some consideration. The Patta of Khoshchi Jirga is Rs. ~~77~~ 59 and that of the other two Jirgas enjoyed by the 1st Respondent is ~~Rs. 77~~ 72. Government therefore decides that Rs. 9 out of the Patta of the 2nd Respondent and Rs. 5 out of the Patta of the 2nd Respondent be paid to the Appellant for her maintenance.

The Deputy Commissioner will arrange accordingly.

10/3/1944

Approved
15-7-44
Chief Secretary

15/7/44

P.F. 105-93

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Tirah District with the proceedings received vide his No. 618, 7th June 1894.

By order

Chief Secretary

M.A. 1/8.

No. 696

22-3-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

15th March 1894

Endorsement granted to Lakshmidevamma, widow of Divasthika of Varadanahalli Sira taluk.

in reply to Her Petition Registered No. 696 dated ~~dated~~ written date received on 6th February, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, regarding the claim of Varadanahalli

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur for his orders as there have been denied.

The enclosures are returned

10/3/94

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

Mysore
Rs 2d 9/91 Encl. 8 Rs 97.

Case to be heard by Committee

(1)

Rupee stamps affixed

Mysore
558
27-10-91

Judgment delivered 21/11/91

REG'D. No. 11538
DATE 29-10-91

Affidavit No. 193 of 1891/92.

Rupee Stamps affixed.

(5) After some time thinking that

& should be exempt as they through Guy
Fawkes present to the native place there
present Shanmalaiya and Ramanna
laboring fully taken the Headmen into
their own hands and prevented me from
doing anything

(6) After I enquired to the circumstances
how they got the Headmen and how they
hurt and lost - Mr Hall
I came to understand that - Mr Saun
Shanmalaiya having received his Pay
husband had order on his side to
look after Mr Livingston and receiving
the circumstances petitioned to the
Deputy Commissioner

I accordingly Mr Freeman wrote
to Rao Deputy Commissioner ordered
that - Shanmalaiya & Ramanna
must - perform the work of Shanbog
but - thinking that - Ramanna will
because Mr Shanbog & Peligars are
thereby ordered not - as other man
should be appointed to perform the
work of the other Peligars (Peraka)
& I petitioned to the deputy commissioner
begging that - Shanmalaiya & Headmen
should - be taken out and that it
should be given to me to work
& must be carried on through a gumasta
or myself in 21/ 8/ 37

In reply to that it was ordered
that it - should not be attended to
other than by the Collector 23/ 8/ 37

10 Accordingly I applied again with
Copies of the present Petition
Commissioner after the Chairman of the
Kachcheri transferred in order to find
out if it had settled it was ordered
that the Petitioner enter into Khal again
on 9th Oct. order so that I beg
your honour now is to enquire
into the Khalkudar in detail and
give favourable reply

I the poor woman having
none to support me and finding
no means of my livelihood I am
troubling myself very much.
Although I am being the wife of the
Khakudar to the Chauffeur and
without enquiring me into the circum-
stances, and at the time of my
husband's death and having taken out
my husbands register wrongly by deceiving
me the unsupportable woman Ramanathan
and Shanmuga have got the Chauffeur
so I beg of your honour to enquire into
the details and confirm my Khakudar
and take the work of Shanthi of the
a Headmaster on my side and
beg of you to support the poor

For which act of kindness
I shall ever be obliged for your
kind compliance of the humble request
and pray for your honour's long
life and prosperity.

I beg to remain
Most Respectfully
your obedient and
humble servant.

25th August 91